



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/463,904	06/05/1995	JOSEPH B. PHIPPS	ARC-2399	9244
48394	7590	10/24/2006	EXAMINER	
DIEHL SERVILLA LLC 77 BRANT AVE SUITE 110 CLARK, NJ 07066				BOCKELMAN, MARK
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		3766		

DATE MAILED: 10/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	08/463,904	PHIPPS, JOSEPH B.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Mark W. Bockelman	3766

All Participants:

Status of Application: _____

(1) Mark W. Bockelman.

(3) _____

(2) Glen Diehl.

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 20 October 2006

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The telephone call was to clarify the interview summary form mailed 10-6-2006. The examiner meant to merely provide a copy of the IDS of 12-11-1996. The examiner checked the wrong box that indicated the case was being allowed. Rather, the completed IDS mailed to applicant was necessary for the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences to consider the appeal..